

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to an Office Action mailed September 4, 2008. Prior to this response, claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-21 were pending. After amending claims 1-2, 5, 10-11, 16, and 20, canceling claims 4, 12, and 14-15, and adding claims 22-25, claims 1-2, 5-11, and 16-25 remain pending.

In Section 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4-7, 10-12, 14-17, and 20-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable with respect to Shimizu (US 2002/0054313) in view of Mori et al. ("Mori"; US 2002/0054313). With respect to claims 1 and 11, the Office Action acknowledges that Shimizu fails supplying IR data to a user interface, but that Mori discloses such a feature, and that it would have been obvious to modify the system of Shimizu to include the print control method of Mori to provide a means of editing document data. This rejection is traversed as follows.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite that scan data is converted into a standard graphical interface format associated with a computer operating system (OS). The Applicant's specification describes GDI as a standard graphical interface format associated with an MS OS. The Office Action acknowledges that Shimizu fails to disclose converting DDI to GDI, but states that Mori discloses converting DDI data to GDI data in the rejection of claim 5.

Beginning at [0178] Mori describes a print processor in a host computer, including the elements of an application 201, a graphic engine 202, a printer driver 203, and a system spooler 204. Fig. 3 is a more detailed depiction of a host computer 3000, which includes all the elements of Fig. 2, plus additional elements such as a previewer 306 and a setting change editor

307. The previewer and setting change editor can be used preview a display, change print settings, and merge print jobs [0190].

In paragraphs [0321-0327] Mori states that if the DDI print instructions are based upon GDI print instructions issued by an application, then a dispatcher loads a spooler stored in external memory [0321]. If the DDI print instructions are based upon GDI print instructions issued by a despooler, the print instructions are sent to a printer driver [0326]. In other words, Mori describes converting GDI data into DDI data. The claimed invention recites an opposite process flow, from scan data (e.g., DDI) to a standard graphical interface format (e.g., GDI). Since this process flow is opposite to all known prior art methods, the preamble has been amended to recite reverse processing a document from a scan subsystem to a document processing application. The normal (forward) process flow is from document processing application to GDI.

An invention is unpatentable if the differences between it and the prior art would have been obvious at the time of the invention. As stated in MPEP § 2143, the *KSR International Co. v Teleflex Inc.* decision (82 USPQ2d 1385, 1395-1397, 2007) suggests 7 exemplary rationales to support a conclusion of obviousness, which include:

A) Combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results;

B) Simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results;

C) Use of known technique to improve similar devices (methods, or products) in the same way;

D) Applying a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results;

E) "Obvious to try" – choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, with a reasonable expectation of success;

F) Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art;

G) Some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in prior art would have lead one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or the combine prior art references teachings to arrive at the claimed invention.

The Office Action states that modifications to Shimizu would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in light of Mori. This rejection appears to be most closely grounded in the G) rationale - Some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in prior art would have lead one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or the combine prior art references teachings to arrive at the claimed invention.

With respect to this rationale, MPEP 2143 (G) states that the rejection must articulate the following criteria to resolve the *Graham* factual analysis:

(1) a finding that there was some teaching, suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings;

(2) a finding that there was a reasonable expectation of success;
and

(3) whatever additional findings based on the Graham factual inquiries may be necessary, in view of the facts of the case under consideration, to explain a conclusion of obviousness.

As noted above, neither Shimizu nor Mori disclose converting scan data to GDI data. Therefore, the combination of Shimizu and Mori fail to explicitly disclose every limitation of claims 1 and 11. Claims 2, 5-7, and 10, dependent from claim 1, and claims 16-17 and 20-21, dependent from claim 11, enjoy the same advantages.

The Office Action states that it would have been obvious to apply the features of Mori to Shimizu's system for the purpose of editing document data. However, the general desire to edit documents does not explicitly suggest that scan data can be converted to a standard graphical interface format. As noted above, the claimed invention describes a scan subsystem operating in a flow that is the reverse of conventional flow. Neither reference mentions the desirability of operating a scan subsystem in a reverse process flow. Neither Shimizu nor Mori describe a means of translating a document from a scan subsystem to a document processing application.

Alternately, a *prima facie* case for obviousness can be based upon evidence that modifications to Shimizu and Mori would have been obvious to one with skill in the art based upon what was well known at the time of the invention. "(A)nalysis [of whether the subject matter of a claim would have been obvious] need not seek out precise teachings directed to the specific subject matter of the challenged claim, for a court can take account of the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art

would employ.” *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1740-41, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007). However, if the *prima facie* rejection is supported by what was known by a person of ordinary skill in the art, then additional evidence should have been provided. Notable, when the source or motivation is not from the prior art references, “the evidence” of motive will likely consist of an explanation or a well-known principle or problem-solving strategy to be applied”. *DyStar*, 464 F.3d at 1366, 80 USPQ2d at 1649.

The only principle or problem-solving strategy mentioned in the Office Action is “editing”. The Office Action does not supply evidence that it, was well known at the time of the invention to convert scan data into a standard graphical interface format.

A *prima facie* analysis of motivation is especially critical in the present circumstances since the rejection is predicated on limitations that are not explicitly disclosed in the prior art references. The claimed invention can only be obvious if an artisan makes substantial modifications to Shimizu and/or Mori. However, there is nothing in the references that suggest than a scan subsystem can be operated in a direction that is the reverse of the convention data flow. Further, no evidence has been provided that such a modification would have been obvious based upon well known principles.

With respect to the second analysis criteria needed to support the G) obviousness rationale, even if a practitioner were given the Mori and Shimizu references as a foundation, no evidence has been provided to show that there is a reasonable expectation of success in the claimed invention. That is, there can be no reasonable expectation of success if the references, and what was known by artisan at the time of the invention, do not teach or suggest all the limitations of the claimed invention.

In summary, the Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obvious has not been supported since the combination of Mori and Shimizu does not explicitly disclose every limitation of claims 1 and 11. Neither has a case been supported that Shimizu can be modified to supply the missing limitations in view of Mori, or what was well known by a person of skill at the time of the invention. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 2, 5-7, 10, 11, 16-17, and 20-21 be removed.

The Office Action has rejected claims 8-9 and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable with respect to Shimizu, Mori, and well known art. The Office Action acknowledges that Shimizu fails to disclose journaled scan data, but takes Official Notice that the ability to scan journaled data is well known in the art. The Office Action states that it would have been obvious convert scanned journaled documents into DDI data for increased user flexibility. This rejection is traversed as follows.

The Official Notice has been combined with Shimizu/Mori predicated upon the assumption that the combination of Shimizu and Mori discloses all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 11. However, as noted above, the combination of Shimizu and Mori fails to teach or suggest that scan data be converted to a standard graphical interface format such as GDI. Therefore, even if the element of journaled scan data is combined with Shimizu/Mori, the combination still fails to disclose the above-mentioned limitations. Claims 8-9, dependent from claim 1, and claims 18-19, dependent from claim 11, enjoy the same advantages.

The Office Action states it would have been obvious to scan journaled documents, and convert them to DDI data, to provide a user with

greater flexibility and options. However, this statement does not explain how a practitioner in the art could have modified the Shimizu/Mori references to yield all the claimed invention limitations. As explained above, even when combined with journaled scan documents, Shimizu/Mori fail to disclose all of the claimed invention limitations. The motivation to supply all the limitations missing in the references cannot be inspired by a general desire to improve flexibility for the user, or even the recognition that journaled scan data can be converted to DDI data. Rather, there must be an explicit teaching in the conversion of journaled scan documents that shows a practitioner how Shimizu/Mori can be modified to yield the conversion of scan data into a standard graphical interface format. Such a *prima facie* case has not been made.

Since the combination of references neither explicitly discloses all the claim limitations, nor suggests modification to Shimizu that would make all the limitations obvious, the Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 8-9 and 18-19 be withdrawn.

It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/15/2008

/Mali/
Gerald Maliszewski
Registration No. 38,054

Customer Number 55,286
P.O. Box 270829
San Diego, CA 92198-2829
Telephone: (858) 451-9950
Facsimile: (858) 451-9869
gerry@ipatentit.net